

A Reply to several passages in Mr. Blochmann's "Contributions to the History and Geography of Bengal," No. III.—By the Translator of the Ṭabakát-i-Násirí, Major H. G. RAVERTY, Bombay Army, (Retired).

It is rarely necessary for either an author or translator to have to defend his work before it is complete, but I find I have to do this in the case of my translation of the Ṭabakát-i-Násirí; and, although I have devoted more than four years to the task of collation of MSS. and to that translation, it is likely, to judge from appearances, to turn out a very thankless one after all.

It was my duty, as a translator, to show that the Calcutta Printed Text is exceedingly incorrect and imperfect. Mr. Blochmann, in note †, page 212 of his "*Contributions to the History of Bengal*," Part I., J. A. S. B., 1873, said "the printed text is untrustworthy."

What I refer to more particularly, are certain strictures contained in IIIId portion of those same "*Contributions*", which I have just received; and, in justice to my translation and to myself, I will reply to them as briefly as possible; but, at the same time, I would remark that criticisms on the MSS. on which I have been working, might have been deferred, at least, until the translation was complete.

The first objection on the part of Mr. Blochmann is [page 275 of his "*Contributions*" No. III. in J. A. S. B., for 1875] my spelling of the word خالچ. I have written Khalj as it is explained and spelt according to the vowel points belonging to it. I also say [in note 3, page 548 of my Translation] that it is written rarely Khalaj [in poetry, for the sake of rhyme]; but to imagine that I could be led, in a matter of sober history, by the "common Indian pronunciation of the adjective," how to pronounce a Turkish word is preposterous: I might as well turn the Khalj Turks into "Ghiljie Patháns" as some have done. My note to the page in question seems to be unpalatable. I have never said that the *yá-i-nisbat* could not be added, and have written it with it in several places, when my author used it—as for example—Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yár, the Khalj, and Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yár, Khaljí. I also wrote on simple *prose*: I did not refer to "rhyme" or poetic license; but I apprehend that Khallají is required to rhyme with "multají" rather than Mr. Blochmann's "*Khalají*."

With regard to the authorities for Malik Kuṭb-ud-Dín's establishing himself at Dihlí, I am told, "Mr. E. Thomas fixes it at 587 H. as consistent with the best authorities." But who are these best authorities? Two

pages farther on, Mr. Blochmann states that "the *Ṭabaqát* is the only authority we possess for this period."

Now I will give an example of Mr. Thomas' "best authorities." At page 11 of his "PATHÁN KINGS OF DEHLI," he says: "In 587, in a more extended expedition into Hindústán, Muhammad Ghori was totally routed on the memorable field of Thaneswar * * * *After a year's repose* * * * on the self-same battle ground, he again encountered his former adversary * * * This time fortune favoured the Ghories * * * By this single victory the Muhammadans may be said to have become the virtual masters of Hindústán," &c., &c.

I will take it for granted that *a year after 587* means 588 H., and that Mr. Blochmann will also allow it.

But now turn to the foot-note at page 23 of the same work. There Mr. Thomas, forgetting, apparently, what he wrote a few pages before, says:—"As regards the historical evidence to the date 587 A. H. for *the capture of Dehli* by the Muslims, it is complete and consistent with the best authorities!"

Mr. Thomas adds "and *Minháj-us-Siráj* repeats in various forms, while treating of the life of Aibeg, the confirmation of the same date." In this I cannot agree with him. Let us turn to page 139 of the Calcutta Printed Text, the foot-note, and also to my Translation, page 515, in both of which it says [leaving out the first defeat by the Hindús, but again referring to *Ḳuṭb-ud-Dín's* being taken captive], he "took possession of that place—*Mírath*—in 587 H. [see note 5, page 515 of my version]. From *Mírath* likewise *he issued forth in the year 588 H.*, and captured *Dihlí*."

These are the actual words in the different MSS. collated. It is not actually said that *Dihlí* was taken in 588 H., merely that *Ḳuṭb-ud-Dín*, in 588 H., marched from *Mírath*, and it must have been towards *the close* of that year, as will be shown farther on, according to the *Táj-ul-Ma'áşir* he had to start to relieve *Hánsí* in the *ninth* month of that year, and only took *Mírath* after that. It is evident, therefore, that *Minháj-ud-Dín* did not intend it to be understood that *Dihlí* was taken and made the seat of government in 588 H., unless he stultifies himself by upsetting his previous statements at pages 248, 378, 456, 457, and 464 of my Translation, which can be compared with the same places in the original MSS.

I will now leave the "best authorities" and go to facts, first mentioning, however, that, in note 9, page 469 of my Translation, I have quoted several other authors for my dates, which note Mr. Blochmann probably has not read, and, further, that they also "must have had very good MSS. of the *Ṭabaqát-i-Náçirí*, some of which in all probability were older" than the Calcutta Printed Text.

Minháj-ud-Dín states [pages 456—477] that troubles arose in *Khwá-*

razm in consequence of the outbreak of Sultán Sháh, the Khwárazmí, in 587 H. ; that, subsequently [but in the *same* year], Sultán Mu'izz-ud-Dín, Muḥammad-i-Sám, advanced into India, took Tabarhindah ; left a garrison there with orders to hold out for *six months*, and was preparing to retire [in consequence of the hot season, it being the third or fourth month, at latest, of 587 H.—April or May, 1191, A. D.] ; was defeated by Ráe Pithorá ; and had to retire, leaving the garrison still there. In the cold season of that year—five or six months after—instead of being able to return as he intended, he was under the necessity of preparing to attend his brother, Sultán Ghiyás-ud-Dín, Muḥammad-i-Sám, along with other dependent Princes and their troops, against Sultán Sháh, the Khwárazmí Prince, who threatened Ghiyás-ud-Dín, Muḥammad's dominions in Khurásán. Besides, Mu'izz-ud-Dín had been badly wounded in the first battle, and it must have taken him some time to recover. This campaign, Minháj-ud-Dín states, at pages 248 and 378, took place in 588 H., and occupied *six months*. Kuṭb-ud-Dín accompanied his master, and was taken captive by the Khwárazmís, but, after a battle, and defeat of the enemy, he was re-captured. "This victory," says Minháj-ud-Dín, "was achieved in the year 588 H."

I also take it for granted that Mr. Blochmann will allow that this capture of Kuṭb-ud-Dín must have taken place *before he captured* Dihlí. But what will totally overturn the theories on this matter, unless people *will not* be convicted, is the fact that Minháj-ud-Dín's relative, Kází, Muḥammad, the Túlakí [Mr. Dowson's "Kází Túlak"], was left with a body of troops to hold Tabarhindah for the space of *six months* [that is to the next cold season—the ninth or tenth month of 587 H.—September or October, 1191 A. D.]. Why did he do this it may be asked ? and the answer is plain enough : he could not remain in India any longer with safety. The hot season was close at hand, and he would have been unable to return if he stayed much longer, for, besides the heat, the six mighty rivers in his rear would have *all been unfordable*, and would have to be crossed by boats, even if boats were procurable, a dangerous matter with regard to most of those rivers at that season, witness the strong Railway Bridges washed away in these days. The Sultán, having been defeated immediately after he placed the Kází in Tabarhindah, and having subsequently to accompany his brother towards Marw, where they were occupied *six months*, could not return as he intended, and the Kází having held out *over thirteen months* [see Translation, page 464], the Sultán still not having come, had to give it up to the Hindús.

Now if we calculate, say, fourteen or fifteen months from the first defeat, for the Sultán's return [*i. e.* from the setting in of the hot season—the *ninth* month of 587 H.] we shall come to the *last month* of 588 H. ; and, in the same way, if we calculate six months of 588 H. for the opera-

tions in Khurásán, we must allow some little time for the Sultán to reach Ghaznín, and he would then even require a month or two to prepare for a campaign in India; and besides, *even if he were ready before*, he could not move towards India during the height of the *hot season*. There were the same six mighty rivers to be crossed, and all unfordable at that period; and all these things being thought of, it was utterly impossible for Sultán Mu'izz-ud-Dín, Muḥammad-i-Sám, to have entered India, at the earliest, before the middle of September or October—the end of the ninth or tenth month of 588 H., previous to which period no man in his senses, would have attempted to march from Ghaznín, to cross the six rivers, and advance into India.

Then followed the battle with Ráe Pithorá, Kuṭb-ud-Dín is left in charge at Kuhrám, and the Sultán prepared to return home again.

These being the facts, how is it possible, on Mr. Thomas's "best authorities," that Kuṭb-ud-Dín could have occupied Dihlí in 587 H.?

I am glad also to find that General Cunningham, on his visit to Dihlí in 1862, considered that 589 H. and not 587 H. was the correct date on the *Minárah*—not of "Quṭbuddín Aibeg," about which so many reams of paper have been written, but of a wholly different KUTB, respecting whom see note 6, page 621, to my Translation. I refer to the date on this *Minárah* about which "doctors disagree," and with regard to which Mr. Thomas would fix on 587 H. for the occupation of Dihlí, and so all other dates must be made to suit it. I suppose, however, that all the "best authorities" never considered *how it could be possible* for Sultán Mu'izz-ud-Dín to be defeated by Ráe Pithorá just before the hot season of 587 H., to take "a year's repose" [Thomas], again enter India, be occupied some time even then against Ráe Pithorá before finally overthrowing him [according to the *Táj-ul-Ma'ášir* also], leave Kuṭb-ud-Dín at Míraṭh, retire again from India, for Kuṭb-ud-Dín, subsequent to all this, to occupy Dihlí, build a great Mosque, upon which [notwithstanding the address of the President of the Archæological Section at the Oriental Congress of 1874] Musalmán artizans brought from different parts of Asia were employed, and all these events *to have happened* in the *one* year of 587 H. ! The idea is simply preposterous.

It occurs to me, on considering this subject further, that the inscription on the fourth circlet of the lower storey of the *Minárah* as given in Thomas [Pathan Kings, pages 21-22] refers not to Mu'izz-ud-Dín, Muḥammad, son of Sám, if the *name* given is correct, but to his elder brother. It will be found at pages 368 and 370 of my Translation, and in the corresponding places in the original, that the elder brother and suzerain of Mu'izz-ud-Dín, Muḥammad, son of Sám, was first called Muḥammad and his title was Shams-ud-Dín, and that the younger brother *was also called Muhammad* and his title was Shiháb-ud-Dín. The first brother after he

came to the throne, assumed the title of “Ghiyás-ud-Dunyá wa ud-Dín, Muḥammad, son of [Bahá-ud-Dín] Sám, Kaşım-i-Amír-ul-Múminín,” and that after the successes in Khurásán, in 588 H., the younger brother, Muḥammad, who, up to that time, bore the title of Shiháb-ud-Dín, *received the title of* Mu'izz-ud-Dín, so, when defeated by Ráe Pithorá, he bore the title of Shiháb-ud-Dín, but after, on his return the second time, Mu'izz-ud-Dín. This may account for the subsequent Indian Muḥammadan writers calling him Shiháb and Mu'izz indiscriminately.

At the period in question, when these inscriptions *are said* to have been recorded [I fancy they were recorded subsequently. See note 6, page 621, of my Translation], the elder brother and *suzerain* was still living, and lived for *ten years after*; and, I imagine, it will be allowed, that the two sovereigns, and both the brothers, *at the same identical time*, could not bear the title of Kaşım-i-Amír-ul-Múminín, or Ghiyás-ud-Dín, and, therefore, leaving out the additional titles, the work of the artist probably, the title in the said inscription is,—“SULTÁN-US-SALÁTÍN, GHIYÁS-UD-DUNYÁ WA UD-DÍN, MUḤAMMAD, BIN SÁM, KAŞÍM-I-AMÍR-UL-MÚMINÍN,” and throughout the inscription [given by Thomas] the name of *Mu'izz-ud-Dín*, or *Shiháb-ud-Dín* even, *never once occurs*.

The Táj-ul-Ma'ásir is quoted as an authority, and a sufficient authority, to upset the statements of Minháj-ud-Dín, whose father, Saráj-ud-Dín, was Kázi of Sultán Mu'izz-ud-Dín's army, and whose kinsman, the Kázi of Túlak, was present on the spot; but I do not place trust in the statements contained in that inflated work, unless they are corroborated or confirmed by some other contemporary writer.

In ELLIOT [page 211, vol. ii.] it is stated that the Táj-ul-Ma'ásir is *rare* in Europe. I have had *four* copies to compare with the extracts from it given in that work, and I find that the date mentioned there—587 H.—for the victory Sultán's [it totally ignores his *defeat*] over Ráe Pithorá, is written *سبع و سبعين* [which may be either *سبع* or *سبع*] without any points in two copies of the four MSS., in the third with one dot over and one under, and in the fourth *سبع*. It is, therefore, evident that that date may be either 7 or 9, just as one chooses to read it; but, as the first battle, *according to every other author who has written on the subject*, took place in 587 H., the same year, 587 H., cannot, for reasons already stated, be the same in which the Sultán defeated Ráe Pithorá, and the former's slave occupied Dihlí. See note 6, page 521, para. 3 of my Translation.

If the “best authorities” had looked at the Táj-ul-Ma'ásir attentively however [see also ELLIOT, vol. ii., page 217], they would have found that, even according to that work, in Ramazán, the *ninth month* of 588 H.—the middle of October [1192 A. D.]—Kuṭb-ud-Dín had to march from Kuhrám to relieve Hánsí [see also note 2 to page 516 of my Translation], and that,

330 H. G. Raverty—*Reply to 'Histy. and Geogr. of Bengal, No. III.'* [No. 3, *subsequently*, “When” [according to ELLIOT, page 219], “the chief luminary threw its shade in the sign of Libra, and temperate breezes began to blow, after putting to flight the army of heat, Kutbu-d-Dín marched from Kahram and took Mirath,” and *subsequent to that* “he then encamped under the fort of *Delhi, which was also captured.*” This means 587 H. I suppose?

If Mr. Blochmann will look at “that excellent work” the *Haft-Iklím*, he may see therein stated, that the defeat of Mu'izz-ud-Dín, Muḥammad-i-Sám, took place in 587 H., his victory in 588 H., and that Dihlí was occupied, as the seat of government, in 589 H.

The *Ṭabakát-i-Akbarí*, the author of which “*must have had good MSS. older than*” mine, also says, “defeated 587 H., victorious 588 H., Dihlí occupied and made the seat of government by Kutb-ud-Dín, in 589 H.”

The *Tazkarat-ul-Mulúk* also says, first battle and defeat of Mu'izz-ud-Dín, 587 H., his victory 588 H., Dihlí *taken* 589 H., and, next year, 590 H., Mu'izz-ud-Dín came again on an expedition to *Ḳinnauj*.

The *Tárikh-i-Alfí* says that the Sultán gained the victory over Ráe Pithorá in the year 578 of the *riḥlat* = 588 H.

The *Zubdat-ut-Tawárikh* also says that Dihlí was made the seat of government in 589 H., and that, in the following year, 590 H., the Sultán returned on the expedition against *Ḳinnauj*.

The *Muntakhab-ut-Tawárikh* likewise says that Dihlí was made the seat of government in 589 H.

Búda'úní and *Firishtah* also will be found to agree with the *Ṭabakát-i-Akbarí*; and, to crown the whole, and put the finishing touch to the picture, Mr. Blochmann's own *Áin* says that the first battle and defeat of the Sultán took place in 587 H., the second and victory in 588 H., and that in *the same year* his slave *took* Dihlí, but nothing is said of his making it the seat of government; and this agrees with the *Táj-ul-Ma'ásir*, where nothing is said of making Dihlí the *capital in that year*; but that, “from Dihlí,” after staying some time there, “he marched forth against Kol, in 590 H.”

I need not say more on this head I think, and do not doubt but that Mr. Thomas is open to conviction.

The next matter is the conquest of Bihár by Muḥammad, *bin Bakht-yár*, the *Khalj*, which Mr. Thomas fixes at 599 H. on the authority, Mr. Blochmann “believes” of the *Táj-ul-Ma'ásir* [ELLIOT's version probably], which states that Kutb-ud-Dín took *Kálinjar* in that year; but the MSS. of the *Táj-ul-Ma'ásir* examined by me, unfortunately, have that same stubborn *سنة* and what makes the date still more doubtful *سنة*—viz. : *سنة و سده و خمسين و خمسين* which, from the want of diacritical points, may be 577, 579, 597, or 599, just as the reader chooses to render the words.

At page 523 of my Translation [note, para. 2] I have noticed that "it is astonishing that the Musalmáns remained quiet for *six years*," assuming that 599 H. was the correct year in which Kálinjar was taken, which, I add, "was the same year in which Sultán Ghiyás-ud-Dín died," but, from the examination of these four MSS. of the *Táj-ul-Ma'ásir* again, I am in doubt whether 597 H. is not the most correct *according to that work*. Minháj-ud-Dín says the Sultán died in 599 H., but, as I have noticed in note 4, page 383, some authors give 597 H., and some 598 H. as the date of his death.

Those who suppose that Bengal was "conquerēd" [the surprise and capture of Núdíah I refer to] in 599 H., do not consider how Muḥammad, *bin Bakht-yár*, could have "reigned," as he is said to have done, "*twelve years*," seeing that he was assassinated in 602 H.

I am told that I am mistaken, according to my own authorities, in connexion with the very doubtful date in the *Táj-ul-Ma'ásir* above referred to. Mr. Blochmann says, page 276, Part III. of his "*Contributions*":—

"(1) That Muhammad Bakhtyár appeared before Quṭbuddín in *Dihlí*, and was rejected by reason of his humble condition.

"According to Major Raverty, *Dihlí* was occupied in 589 H.*; hence Muhammad Bakhtyár must have been rejected in or after 589 H.

"(2) After his rejection, Muhammad Bakhtyár goes to *Badáon*, where Hizabr gives him a fixed salary.

"(3) *After some time* Muhammad Bakhtyár goes to *Audh*, where he obtains certain fiefs near the *Bihár* frontier. He now undertakes plundering expeditions, which continue, according to the printed text, *for one or two years*.

In a foot-note is added, "Major Raverty has left this out."

"(4) He invades Southern *Bihár*† and takes the town of *Bihár*. He then goes to *Dihlí*, where he remains for some time at Quṭb's court.

"(5) *The second year after his conquest of Bihár*, he sets out for *Bengal*, and takes *Nadiyá*.

"Now how is it possible, with these five chronological particulars, that "Muhammad Bakhtyár could have left *Bihár*, as Major Raverty says, in 589 H. to invade *Lakhnauṭí*, if Quṭb occupied *Dihlí* in 589?" [A foot-note has, Major Raverty says that Muhammad Bakhtyár presented himself to *the Sultán* at *Láhor*, but the text has *Dihlí* (page 549).] "It would, indeed, "be a close computation if we allowed but five years for the above events, "*i. e.* if we fixed the conquest of *Bengal* as having taken place in 594 H., "or A. D. 1198."

* Early in 589 H.

† It should have been stated above that his fiefs were close to the frontier of South *Bihár*, as in my translation.

To this my reply is that the text (page 549), says *not one word* about "Muhammad Bakhtyár" presenting himself before "*the Sultán* at Láhor" ["*the Sultán*" in this instance was *a slave*, continued a slave during his master's lifetime, and did not obtain his freedom and the title of Sultán until 605 H.—only *about fifteen years after this time!* See page 389 of Translation, and corresponding place in the original]. The words in my Translation are, that "Muhammad-i-Bakht-yár presented himself *before the Muster-Master at Dihlí,*" and so, the probability is, that Malik Kutb-ud-Dín was at Láhor, as I have stated in note 6, page 550, *on the authority of another writer*, and Muhammad, bin Bakht-yár, straightway went to Husám-ud-Dín, Ughul-Bak.

If looked at in a different light, although the time seems very short, it is not so utterly impossible for Muhammad, *bin* Bakht-yár, to have waited on Kutb-ud-Dín at Láhor, or gone to Ughul-Bak, as the case may be, proceeded to Awadh, have been sent to Bhíulí and Bhagwat, have taken Bihár which only required a party of 200 horsemen (in fact, it may be said Muhammad, *bin* Bakht-yár, took it alone) and might have occupied him a couple of weeks, or even say a month from his fiefs, a distance of under 200 miles as the crow flies, have gone to Dihlí to Kutb-ud-Dín in 589 H. or to Mahobah, as the case may be, and have invaded Bengal the following year, for *the second year after* means the following year—I quote my authors as I find them. That in the *following year after* 589 H., he took Núdíah, agrees with the statement of Shíam Parshád, whose work Mr. Blochmann, of course, has referred to; but he appears not to have noticed the statement of Minháj-ud-Dín at page 556 of my Translation [page 150 of the printed text], that when Muhammad, *bin* Bakht-yár, *returned* from the presence of Kutb-ud-Dín, *he* subdued Bihár, thus contradicting his previous statement.

The only thing I can blame myself for in this matter is, that I did not mention in a note, that the printed text, which at one time is so utterly untrustworthy, and then so trustworthy, contained the words "*matters went on in this way for ONE or TWO years*" after the words "and ravaged that territory," at page 551 of my Translation. The reason why I did not do so is, that, in all probability, I did not look at the printed text here, or that it escaped my attention, otherwise I certainly should have done so: I think I have noticed the printed text pretty often, when *right* as well as when *wrong*. I had no object not to do so: I had built up no theory or made statements anywhere else that I wished to support. I might also have added that the two MSS. on which that printed text is based, two of the three worst of those collated, contain the same words, and that all the other collated MSS. *had no such words*.

I would, however, remark here that I did not profess to translate the Calcutta Printed Text, but to translate the work from MSS., and as advertised on the covers of the Society's publications.

Why the expression "some years before 601 H." can make it clear ["Contributions," page 277] that Núdíah "must have been taken about 594 H. or 595 H., i. e. in A. D. 1198 or 1199," any more than about 591, 2, 3 or even 596 or 7, I am at a loss to understand. But one thing, at least, is very clear, that the year 599 H. for the conquest of Bengal, even "as consistent with the best authorities," is utterly impossible.

Another theory is then raised. Although it is clear to Mr. Blochmann that Núdíah "must have been taken in 594 or 595 H.," the statement contained in the Táj-ul-Ma'áşir [*Firishtah*, who merely copies from his immediate predecessors, more particularly, is a *very* trustworthy authority to quote!] that Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yár waited on Kuṭb-ud-Dín at Mahobah in 599 H.—a doubtful date in that work, as before stated, which may be 597 H. and *four or five years after* Mr. Blochmann says Bengal was conquered—"involves no contradiction as far as chronology is concerned." No, not in the least, even though Minháj-ud-Dín states, that Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yár waited on Kuṭb-ud-Dín *before* he surprised Núdíah. With that city Bengal—or rather Lakhanawatí—fell. There is no mention of any fighting after; and so, if it is correct, according to the Táj-ul-Ma'áşir, that Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yár only waited on Kuṭb-ud-Dín at Mahobah, in 599 H., not *from* AWADH and BIHAR as incorrectly rendered in ELLIOTT'S ver-

sion, [page 232, vol. ii.], but from ^{ادوند} بهار—^{ادوند}—the points are thus given—according to the text of the Táj-ul-Ma'áşir, I now have before me, that city could only have been taken after that time—599 H. See also footnote page 276 of the "Contributions," in which it is contended that ^{ادوند}—as Minháj-ud-Dín writes it—cannot be correct because the Calcutta Text has ^{ادوند}. The author of the *Ṭabakát-i-Akbarí*, like some others, takes Muḥammad, son of Bakht-yár, from the presence of Mu'izz-ud-Dín *direct* to Husám-ud-Dín, Ughal-Bak, and says, that Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yár, when subsequently he came to Kuṭb's presence, "was deputed to conquer Lakhanawatí."

The *Tazkarat-ul-Mulúk* also takes Muḥammad-i-Bakht-yár *direct* from Ghaznín to Ughal-Bak, and states that he took Bihár before he went to Kuṭb-ud-Dín].

"The time fixed upon by Mr. Thomas for the conquest of Bengal is 599 H., that is, *four or five years after* the time assumed by Mr. Blochmann, while I have stated, according to my author, the year following 589 H., that is 590 H.—but *three or four years before* Mr. Blochmann's chosen time. Mr. Thomas is only "a little too late:" mine is "impossible as being too early." Probably Mr. Blochmann has not noticed that at page

340 of the *Ro. As. J.*, vol. vi. for 1873, Mr. Thomas has again *changed in his ideas*, and says “*the first occupation of Bengal by Muhammad Bakht-yár Khiljí*” was “in 600 A. H.”

I now come to another chief point in this discussion.

Mr. Blochmann “thought” the name of “Qutbuddín of the Paralyzed *Hand*,” [see BRIGGS’ translation of *Firishtah*, noticed in note at page 519 and 521 of my Translation, which makes a very energetic warrior of him, considering his “Paralyzed Hand”], had been “set at rest” by Mr. Thomas—but in this I cannot agree any more than in the date 599 and 600 H. for the conquest of Bengal—and says that my different MSS. “have clearly the same words as the *Bibl. Indica* Edition of the *Ṭabaqát*”: my MSS. run thus:—

بظاهر جمالی نداشت و انگشت خنصر او شکستگی داشت

but, in the Calcutta Text, after the word او, the words از دست—“of a” or “the hand”—occur, and the Hamilton MS., the worst of the whole number collated, has the same, but *the other two MSS. from which the Printed Text is taken have not those words*, and another MS. has از پا—“of a” or “the foot”—but all the rest of the MSS. are as I have given it above, and translated it.

I fail to see much difference in Mr. Blochmann’s “literal translation:”—“*Outwardly* he had no comeliness, and *his* little FINGER [of one hand] possessed an infirmity. For this reason they called him *Aibak-i-shall* [Aibak with the paralyzed HAND]” and my:—“He possessed no outward comeliness, and the little *finger* [of one hand?] had a fracture, and on that account he used to be styled *I-bak-i-Shil* [the powerless-fingered].” The only difference is that where I translate داشت *had*, Mr. Blochmann translates it *possessed*—a mighty difference truly—and that I translate the word گفتندی—*guftandí* which is the *imperfect* tense of the verb, used also to imply continuity or *habitude*, and is *not the PAST tense*, and that I give to شکستگی the meaning of a concrete noun. I see no reason to alter my translation, as lexicographers, who are supposed to know something of the meanings of words, render شکستگی *a rupture, a fracture, defeat, as well as breaking, brokenness, &c.*

Mr. Blochmann calls the *Haft-Iklím* “an excellent work,” and in this I quite agree with him. Let him look at it, however, and he will find with respect to *Qutb-ud-Dín, I-bak-i-Shil*, that, in it, are the following words—از این که انگشت خنصر او شکسته بود او را ایبک میگفتند—which I defy any one to translate otherwise than—*from, or on this, that his little FINGER WAS BROKEN they used to call him I-bak.*” Which hand is not stated.

The author of the *Ṭabaqát-i-Akbarí, Budá’úní*, and even *Firishtah*, all of whom Mr. Blochmann states [*“Contributions,”* page 280], MUST HAVE

HAD *very good MSS. of the Tabaqát-i-Náçirí*, all have THE VERY SAME WORDS, copying one from the other, as are contained in the Haft-Iklím, the Tazkarat-ul-Mulúk has the same, and also the Muntakhab-ut-Tawárikh. Some others say the same, but I need not name them here, as those I have mentioned are easily obtained for reference, but all leave out the شل without which ايبك—finger, is meaningless. Mr. Blochmann quotes the *Shams-ul-Lughat*: let him look at it for the word ايبك and he will see these words—انكشت ايبك بكسر به معني انكشت—“*I-bak with kasr means FINGER,*” as well as the *other* meanings mentioned in the “*Contributions.*”

The Táríkh-i-Majámi'-ul-Khiyár—not the work even of a resident in India—has چون انكشت خنصر او شكسته بود اورا ايبك شل گفتند—“As his little finger *was broken*, they called him *I-bak-i-Shil.*” The Zubdat-ut-Tawárikh, which copies Minháj-ud-Dín, has the same words as given in my Translation; and it is satisfactory to know that those authors who say his little finger *was broken*, read the word شكستكي as I have read it. Of course, neither Minháj-ud-Dín, nor any other who writes *I-bak-i-Shil* which even, on Mr. Blochmann's own showing, is in the Calcutta Printed Text as in other copies, is right in putting شل whether it be *shil* or *shall* LAST, and it ought, according to Mr. Blochmann, to be *inverted* into “*Shil-Aibak,*” otherwise it is “*un-Persian.*” None of these authors who write *I-bak-i-Shil* therefore, according to this theory, could have known their own language! He also, in his literal translation, renders the passage “and his little *finger* [of one hand] possessed an infirmity,” and yet he turns him into “*Aibak with the paralyzed HAND.*” Because one finger was broken, or “possessed an infirmity,” it does not follow that the whole hand was paralyzed. Mr. Blochmann could not have thought of these matters when he proceeded to criticise the correctness of my Translation.

I have never said that *I-bak* alone meant *I-bak of the broken finger*, but, with *shil* added to it—*I-bak-i-Shil*—as I have already stated in note 1, page 513-14 of my Translation, and I have also stated that, in *Turkish*, *I-bak* “means finger” only: *not* broken or fractured-fingered, or the like. Mr. Blochmann could not have read the notes through, or failed to see what I said of *I-bak-i-Lang* in the same note. Nor have I said that *I-bak* was not Turkish, for he was a *Turk*, and so bore a Turkish name.

Neither have I ever hinted, much less stated, that his *real name* was Kutb-ud-Dín: to have said so would have been absurd. That is his Musalmán titular name only, as Shams-ud-Dín was the Musalmán name title of his slave, I-yal-timish. In my note 1, page 513, I have said that Kutb-ud-Dín could *not have been his real name*, nor *I-bak* either, which I looked upon as a nick-name or by-name. So Mr. Blochmann here, unknown to himself probably, has come to the same conclusion. I should not write his name however under any circumstance “*Qutbuddín,*” any more than I

should translate it *The polestar of the faith*, but Kutb-ud-Dín—The Polestar of [the] Faith.

There is not the least cause for "the *izáfat*" to be cancelled in *Y-bak-i-Shil*: to do so would be contrary to the primary and simplest rules of the Persian Grammar—the *Írání* I mean—of the "*Túrání*" dialect I know nothing. In *Shil Y-bak* an adjective precedes the noun, and the *اضافت*—*izáfat*—does not take place; but, when the adjective or qualifying word follows the noun, the *kasrah* of *izáfat* is required. See the "*Aín*," page 629 for an example, where Mr. Blochmann himself writes "*A'ZAM KHÁN*, vide *KHÁN-I-A'ZAM*." Any Persian Grammar, however simple, will show this, as well as Lumsden, or Sir W. Jones, Forbes, &c. The following is given as an example, and is very pertinent to the subject:—

"The last letter of every Persian word is quiescent, or un-accented—i. e. *ساکن* as *اسب* *asp*, a horse; *دست* *dast*, a hand; *مرد* *mard*, a man. But, in composition, when such word is either the *مضاف*—*muzáf*, or governing noun, or the *موصوف* *mauṣúf*, or substantive noun, the last letter must be accented with the *kasrah* of *izáfat*: as for example—*اسب جلد* *asp-i-jald*—a swift horse; *دست زید* *dast-i-Zaid*—the hand of Zaid; *مرد نیک* *mard-i-nek*—a good man; *راه راست* *ráh-i-rást*—a true or right way, the *kasrah* being the sign of the governing noun, or the antecedent of the relative adjective."

Again: "When the adjective follows the substantive, the latter must be accented with the *kasrah*; as *اسب سیاه* *asp-i-siáh*—a black horse, but, on the contrary, when the adjective precedes the noun, the *kasrah* must not be used, as *سیاه اسب* *siáh asp*—a black horse. The same rule is likewise applicable to the governing and the governed nouns substantive; as *زمین بادشاهان* *bádsháhán-i-zamín*—kings of the earth; *شاه جهان* *sháh-i-jahán*—king of the world; *جهان شاه* *jahán-sháh*—world king," &c.

When I learned these simple rules just *thirty years since*, I did not expect I should have to quote them again. *Shil Y-bak* therefore and *Y-bak-i-Shil*, and *Y-bak-i-Lang*, as he is styled in the *Jámi'-ut-Tawárikh*, and in *Fanákatí*, come under these rules, but no writer who pretended to elegance of style would prefer the former to the latter. I am quite content to leave this to any Persian scholar—Persian or European. In *میر ماه* which Mr. Blochmann himself translates [page 136] "*Lord of the Moon*," why is he so *un-Persian*, and why does he not "cancel the *izáfat*," and write *Moon Lord*? and without an *artificial izáfat* whence comes "*of the*?"

I do not know that any one has said that Mr. Thomas is *not* quite correct in looking upon *ایبک* as "the original name." I, certainly, have not said so. I only write *Y-bak* what Mr. Thomas writes *Aibeg* and Mr. Bloch-

mann *Aibak*, but I think Mr. Blochmann would have some difficulty in showing me the word written with a *madd*, viz. *ايبك*. He certainly cannot show it to me in any copy of the *Ṭabakát-i-Násirí*. I never saw it so written.

As to what is given as the legend on coins he is said to have issued, and his being merely called *Y-bak* therein, which Mr. Blochmann deems quite sufficient to refute me by my own remarks, it is evident that, before Mr. Blochmann had calmly read my statements, he penned this portion of his "*Contributions*." I read in the legend given at page 525 of my Translation the words—*Sultán Kutb-ud-Dín, Y-bak*, as plain as it is possible to print. He would scarcely have put *shil* or *shall* upon his coins. Did *Tímúr* add the word *Lang* to the legend on his? Of course not: but I will not give the legend here. See the ADDITIONAL NOTE to my Translation, on the subject of the legends on these coins: end of *Násir-ud-Dín, Maḥmúd Sháh's* reign, page 717.

I do not consider that Mr. Thomas or any one else has "set this question at rest" with respect to "*Aibeg*;" and had Mr. Blochmann not been quite so hasty he might have read a note in my Translation, a little farther on, where I have remarked upon the number of other *Maliks* styled *ايبك*—some five or six or more, including *Ulugh-Khán's* brother. I have endeavoured to get a real Turkish scholar to give me his ideas upon several Turkish titles in the *Ṭabakát-i-Násirí*, and perhaps, before this is sent off, I may receive his reply.

As to there being no such word as *shil* in Persian meaning limp, weak, soft, paralyzed, &c. [*Contributions*," page 278] I do not agree with Mr. Blochmann. It is not *Túrání*, and may be *Yrání*, or possibly local, and peculiar to the *Fársíwáns* of *Afghánistán*, but is commonly used; and another Persian word—*shul*—is used with it in the sense mentioned. As to Mr. Blochmann's "*rare Arabic word shal or shall* [which "*rare*" word I have also referred to in my note, page 513], he says it means "having a withered hand," but I say it means a *hand* or *foot* paralyzed or powerless, &c., on the authority of an excellent Lexicon in Persian, which explains it thus:—

و بعربي دست و پاي را گویند که از کار باز مانده باشد

I think I may venture to assert that *Sultán Mu'izz-ud-Dín, Muḥammad*, son of *Sám*, was rather unlikely to have purchased a slave with the whole of one *hand* paralyzed: a finger broken or paralyzed would have been no very great detriment, but how could a one-hand paralyzed man fight on horseback? See too the wonderful feats *Dow* and *BRIGGS*—not *Firishtah*—make him perform. As to its being "*a rare Arabic word*" I beg to say that it is a *most common* one among the *Afgháns*: in fact, they rarely ever use another word, except by adding *شل* *shull* to it—"*shall-o-shull*." See my *Pushto Dictionary*, page 656.

In the following page [279] of his "*Contributions*" Mr. Blochmann, referring to my mentioning in a note to my Translation, that Arám Sháh, said to be the son of I'-bak, and, by some, the adopted son, is called I'-bak's *brother* by Abú-l-Fazl, says he takes "the opportunity to justify Abul-Fazl, and that, in his [own] *Aín* text, Abul-Fazl states twice distinctly that Arám Sháh was Aibak's son." Mr. Blochmann's *Aín* may, but in my *Aín*—the MS. I quoted, and which is now before me—a "good old copy"—has these words, in which *may be* a clerical error:—

در چوگان بازی نقد زندگانی در باخت امرا آرام شاه برادر او را بر مسند فرماندهی
نشانده

At page 279 of his "*Contributions*" Mr. Blochmann considers the word *آی* *ái* "a moon" in the word *ایپک* to occur in other names of Indian History, and in what he calls "*Ai-tigín*" or *E'tigín* [he is not certain which perhaps: *آی* can be written *E*, in *Túrání* probably], and in "*Ai-lititnish*, the *emperor* Altamsh," but unfortunately *آی* with *madd* over the *l* does not occur in either of those names, nor will Mr. Blochmann show them to me so written even in the *Bibl. Indica* edition of the "*Ṭabaqát.*"

If "*Ai-lititnish*" be the name of the so-called "emperor" [but why not write also the "emperor" Maḥmúd, son of Sabuk-Tigín, the "emperor" Mu'izz-ud-Dín, and the "emperor" Kutb-ud-Dín? They were Sultáns by title as well as "*Ai-lititnish*" was], and if "*Ai-lititnish*" be right, why style him "Altamsh" still? Such must be "behind modern research." If *آی* be contained in the words *ایتکین* and *ایلتمش*—there are no *madds* here—and is entirely separate from the *تکین* and *لتمش* of those words, how does Mr. Blochmann account for the words *قلمش* *Qal-timish*, *تقتمش* *Taq-timish*, and *سالتمش*—*Sal-timish*? These are names often occurring as well as *ایلتمش**—*I-yal-timish*, elsewhere than in Indian history, because they are Turk names, but the last part of these compound words is *تمش* sometimes written *تمیش* and *تتمش* and the first part *قل*—*ق*—*سل* and *ایل* respectively, and not *آی* at all. After this same fragile theory, *I-yal-Arsalán*—*ایل ارسالان*, *I-yal-ká*—*ایلکا*, and *I-yal-dúz*—*ایلدوز* which latter the author of the *Ṭabaqát-i-Násirí* and some others write *یلدوز* *Yal-dúz* [where is the "*آی* *ái* 'a moon' " here? *ایلدوز* is said to mean *a star* in Turkish], those names must be written *Ai-liarsalán*, *Ai-liká*, and *Ai-lildúz*. I should like to know the titles of these "oldest Dictionaries" which give the pronunciation "*Ai-lititnish*." No, no, the "*آی* *ái* 'a moon' " in these last names is all *moonshine*.

Again Mr. Blochmann makes everything succumb to "metrical passages" and poetry while I treat of prose.

I have included the name of *ایلتمش**—*I-yal-timish*, as one of my

* Major Raverty's original contains *sukúns* above the *lám*, *mím*, and *shín*. Ed.

three oldest MSS. of the *Ṭabaqát-i-Náṣirí* writes it *with the points*, among the Turkish titles or by-names referred to a Turkish scholar.

In the order of Mr. Blochmann's strictures I come now to "dangerous innovations" in spelling names, but, for convenience, I will notice them last, and proceed to another most important point. He says, page 279 :—

"The only thing we knew hitherto (and I believe it is all we know now) is that the conqueror of Bengal was called

Muhammad Bakhtyár,

and the name of his paternal uncle was

Muhammad Mahmúd.*

"The names of these two persons Major Raverty breaks up, by introducing an artificial *izáfát*, or sign of the genitive" [see *ante* on the use of the *izáfát* and the *كسرة توصيفي* and any Grammar on the subject], "into four names, *viz.* Muhammad-i-Bakhtyár, and Muhammad-i-Mahmúd * *

"Major Raverty says in explanation that "in his older MSS." the word *bin*, or son, is inserted between the words Muhammad and Bakhtyár *in the heading* of Chapter V., which contains the biography of the conqueror of Bengal; hence the conqueror of Bengal was Muhammad, and "the father's name, it appears, was Bakhtyár, the son of Mahmúd." It is not stated in how many MSS. this *bin* occurs; but, though it occur in the heading, it never occurs in the text.

"The name of Muhammad Bakhtyár occurs more than thirty times in Major Raverty's Chapters V. and VI. (pages 548 to 576); but in every case Major Raverty gives Muhammad-i-Bakhtyár, *i. e.* the *Izáfát*. Hence his *MSS.* have no *bin* in the text. In the heading of Chapter VI., there is no *bin*, though Major Raverty puts it in; he tries even to do so in the heading to Chapter VIII., in the name of Husámuddín 'Iwaz, and "one or two authors" get the credit of it."

My answer is, I "put" nothing "in": "nor does the word *bin* occur in the MSS. of the *Táj-ul-Ma'ásir*, in *Firishtah*, the *Ṭabaqát-i-Akbarí*, *Badáoní*, and later writers, though the authors of these histories must have had very good MSS. of the *Ṭabaqát-i-Náṣirí*, some of which in all probability were older than those in Major Raverty's possession. Hence I look upon the correctness of the solitary *bin* in the headings of some of Major Raverty's MSS. as doubtful." The *Táj-ul-Ma'ásir* has no *Arabic headings* like the *Ṭabaqát-i-Náṣirí*, and does not use the word *bin*, but, that work not being written in the *Túrání* idiom, the *Kasrah* of *izáfát*, where necessary, is understood. The author of the *Táj-ul-Ma'ásir* could not have had a good or an old copy of the "*Ṭabaqát*" seeing it was only written *thirty years* and more after that work. Neither has the *Ṭabaqát-i-Akbarí* *Arabic headings*, Budá'úní says he copies from his patron's

* Where is it so stated before I stated it?

work. I have already shown, in my notes 6 and 4 to pages 697 and 711, and in many other places of my Translation, what the Ṭabakát-i-Akbarí is. The Author in all probability *saw* the Ṭabakát-i-Náṣirí, but, as I suppose, he did not *take the trouble to collate* different copies, and contented himself with one—for example the I. O. L. MS. 1952, “a good old copy” too, which one person, at least, styles an “autograph”—the short-comings of the Ṭabakát-i-Akbarí may be accounted for. Firishtah contains *nothing whatever*—not a *single event*—respecting the Turk Sulṭáns of the Mu'izzí and Shamsí dynasties, but what is contained in the Ṭabakát-i-Akbarí, even to the poetical quotations and the blunders also.

I do not *propose* to change the name of the “conqueror of Bengal”: I *do* more. I *do* change it, without the least hesitation, on the authority of the best extant copies of the text of the “Ṭabaqát,” which work, as Mr. Blochmann most correctly observes, “*is the only authority we possess for this period,*” and it will require positive proof to the contrary to make me give up the point. Because a name has been written incorrectly before, on wrong assumption, or on mere theories, and because the two names Muḥammad and Bakht-yár have been handed down and repeated from one writer to another as that of *one* man only, is there any reason why such error should be obstinately stuck to through thick and thin?

But at the same time I must state that I have naught to gain or lose by the change: I have no object in changing it, and only do so on the “undoubted authority” of my author. The matter lies in a nut-shell: either the father *was called* Bakht-yár, or he was *not*. If he was so called, then *he* has hitherto had the credit for *what his son* performed.

As to Muḥammad with the *kasrah* of *izáfat* being correct, I fancy Mr. Blochmann, even in a Muḥammadan “School Register,” [a great authority certainly,] never found one person called Muḥammad Maḥmúd without the last referred to his father—certainly not if a Musalmán in his senses wrote it down. But with regard to the “conqueror’s” name, *i. e.* Muḥammad, and Bakht-yár, that is Bakht-yár-ud-Dín, his father’s name, the word *bin*—son of—I first noticed in the oldest British Museum copy, one of the three best I have had for my translation, and Professor Rieu, on whose words, opinion, and experience in such matters, I place implicit confidence, considers it a MS. of the 14th century, or about a century after the time that Minháj-ud-Dín wrote. The word *bin* also occurs in the other British Museum MS., and in the best St. Petersburg copy, which is another of the three I refer to, and in the very old copy I have—which apparently looks, but may not be, much older than either of the other two—the whole of the headings are pointed, and in this last MS. the word *bin* does not occur, for at this particular place, as well as in a few other instances where *bin*, as in the case of Muḥammad *bin* Súrí, of whom more anon, *is* subsequently given, the *bin* has clearly been left out, accidentally, by the copyist.

The word *bin*—Mr. Blochmann's "solitary *bin*"—also occurs in the best Paris copy. So *bin*—"son of"—occurs in four MSS. : in three of the best and oldest copies ; the *izáfat* in a fourth *which often uses the izáfat for BIN in other instances where son of is undoubtedly meant* ; and *bin* in a fifth considered to be a precious "autograph" of the author's. In the other MSS. vowel-points are not marked, but the *izáfat* is, without doubt, meant there, as in other places where not marked. The "one or two authors" seems to be disapproved of—I had an object in not stating all my authors' names at the time.

I can give hundreds of such like instances of *bin* and an *izáfat* being used indiscriminately. But just look at the Calcutta Printed Text for example—the first page that meets the eye—page ۴۴ 44, the heading is "Al Amír Muḥammad, *bin* 'Abbás," and immediately under, second line, are the words:—*ممالك غور * * * * * بامير محمد عباس سپرد* and, as rendered in my version, page 332, "He made over the kingdom of Ghúr to Amír Muḥammad-*i*-'Abbás," and which Mr. Blochmann, according to his theory, would have written "Amír Muḥammad 'Abbas," and so have made *one person of the plural*. There is another good example at pages ۱۱۴ and ۲۱۵ *viz.*:—*غياث الدين محمود بن محمد سام*—Ghiyás-ud-Dín, Maḥmúd *bin* Muḥammad-*i*-Sám. Here *bin* is used for one person—the son, and an *izáfat* understood and required for another person—the father : there is no *izáfat* marked, but it *must* be used, because Muḥammad, his father, was not called Sám, but he was the son of Sám—that is Bahá-ud-Dín, Sám. Ghiyás-ud-Dín, Maḥmúd's father's name, is written in full in the headings with *bin*, but under, *غياث الدين محمد سام*—Ghiyás-ud-Dín, Muḥammad-*i*-Sám, and likewise his brother's, *معز الدين محمد سام*—Mu'izz-ud-Dín, Muḥammad-*i*-Sám, but, by the theory put forth in the "*Contributions*," and the system followed in the translation of the "*Aín-i-Akbarí*," they would both be turned into Sám which alone refers to their father, and not to them, as the headings as well as the text—including the printed text—most undoubtedly show, and many other examples are to be found in the work. The names in the headings are written in Arabic, in every copy, throughout the whole book, and in the body of the work, according to the Persian idiom, the *izáfat* for *bin* is understood, as is also the case with the name of Ikhtiyár-ud-Dín, Muḥammad, *bin* Bakht-yár-ud-Dín, the Khalj, and others.

Another matter tending to prove that Bakht-yár is the father's titular name, is the fact that the author of the *Ṭabaḳát-i-Akbarí*—one of those who must have had the old and correct MSS.—styles him, "Malik Muḥammad-*i*-Bakht-yár-ud-Dín." Muḥammad *could not possibly* be called Bakht-yár-ud-Dín, and Ikhtiyár-ud-Dín *too*.

The same author, by the bye, at the head of the chapter, styles the "conqueror" of Bengal IKHTIYÁR-UD-DÍN, MUHAMMAD, *only*. Why? Because he understood that Bakht-yár-ud-Dín was his father's name.

“Further,” says Mr. Blochmann, “supposing *bin* to be correct, is it “not strange, nay totally un-Persian, to speak continually of Muhammad-*bin*-Bakhtyár, or Muhammad-*i*-Bakhtyár, instead of using the single name “of Muhammad? This would be Arabic usage. Thirdly, if Mahmúd were “the grandfather, it would have been extraordinary on the part of the author “to have left out the grandfather in the heading, and in the beginning of “the chapter, when Muhammad Bakhtyár’s descent is spoken of, and merely “incidentally to mention it in connexion with the paternal uncle.”

It certainly would be *un*-Persian to speak continually of Muḥammad-*bin* Bakht-yár, hence, after the Arabic heading, as in other places throughout the whole work of Minháj-ud-Dín, the Persian izáfat is understood. Scores of examples in the text also show that a man’s single name, such for example as Muḥammad would be here, is unusual except in the case of some slaves whose fathers’ names appear to have been unknown. So engrafted is the custom of using the father’s name with the son’s [but not the grandfather’s], that in our Indian Courts we find *bin* and *walad* always used, and even in Bombay we find low-caste Hindús, Dehrs, &c., styled, for example—“Lakhsman, *walad* Nursia,” and “Pándú *bin* Santo,” &c. A grandfather’s name is very seldom put in the headings of the *Ṭabaḳát-i Násirí*—it is not usual to do so. Had the paternal uncle’s name occurred in a heading the word *bin* would have been written no doubt; but, as I have before noticed, did any person ever hear one man called Muḥammad Maḥmúd? I know, however, that one of the sons of Maḥmúd of Ghaznín is styled Muḥammad-*i*-Maḥmúd, and that his uncles are styled, Naṣr-*i*-Sabuk-Tigín, and Yúsuf-*i*-Sabuk-Tigín respectively. What a nice thing for a translator to make one man of them!

“Lastly,” writes Mr. Blochmann, “the use of the Izáfat, instead of “*bin* or *pisar* (son), is restricted to poetry, and does not occur in prose [see “note‡, page 280]. I see therefore, no reason to change the name of the “conqueror of Bengal, as proposed by Major Raverty.”

This is a matter of such vital importance that I must give two examples of what may be caused through a translator not knowing where to place the izáfat so much objected to, as never occurring in Persian *prose*, in place of *bin*, son of, and which is so “*un*-Persian.”

A careful and conscientious writer like ELPHINSTONE says, in Book V, Chapter I, of his History of India, that “Mahommed-Cásim” invaded Sind; and, page after page, and paragraph after paragraph, it is said that “Cásim” did this, and “Cásim” did that, and that “the Mohametan arms ceased with the death of Cásim.”

In ELLIOT also, Vol. I, page 138, the extract from the Chach-námah commences with the death of Ráe Dáhir “at the hands of Muhammad Kásim Sakifí.” These names—for they are used as that of *one* person—

“Muhammad Kásim” occur in scores of places throughout the extract, but, at page 157 we also have “Imádu-d-dín Muhammad Kásim *bin* Abí 'Akíl Sakifí.

Now “Cásim” or “Kásim” had nothing whatever to do with Sind or its conquest. He was *dead* before *his son*, Muḥammad, was appointed by his uncle to lead the 'Arabs into Sind, and so the father, who was in his grave at the time, has had credit up this moment, in our Histories of India, for what his son performed, in the same manner that Bakht-yár-ud-Dín, the Khalj, has had the credit for what his son, Ikhtiyár-ud-Dín, performed.

From Ṭabarí downwards, the name of the conqueror of Sind is 'Imád-ud-Dín, Muḥammad, *son* of Kásim, *son* of Muḥammad, *son* of Ḥakam, *son* of Abú-'Uḳail, and Al-Biládurí, an extract from whose work is given in Elliot, says the same as Ṭabarí; but because the author of the Chach-Námah headed his Chapters in Persian instead of Arabic, the necessary *izáfat* was not recognized, and hence this lamentable error. Such is history.

Examples of this I have already given; but turn to page ۴۰—40 of the Calcutta Printed Text, which is the same as other copies in these instances, and the fourth line from the heading are these words *سبکتگین رسید چون تخت غزنین بامیر* *chún takht-i-Ghaznín ba Amír Mahmúd-i-Sabuk-Tagín rasíd*. Does Mr. Blochmann mean to assert that Sabuk-Tigín is not the father's name? So much for the random assertion that “the *izáfat* instead of *bin* or *pisar* [which last I have not used] is *restricted to poetry, and does not occur in prose*,” and according to the foot-note that it “*is rare in poetry, and poets do not like to use this Izáfat*.” If Mr. Blochmann met with the following in Indian History—*شهاب الدوله هارون بغرا ایلیک خان*—I wonder what he would think of it: he would write it “Shihábuddaulah Hárún Bughrá 'l-lak Khán,” and make one person of it. I, however, would read it—“Shiháb-ud-Daulah, Hárún-i-Bughrá-i-'l-lak-Khán,” because I know for certain that Hárún who is entitled Shiháb-ud-Daulah is the son of Bughrá, who is the son of the 'l-lak Khán, who is named Músá, who were Kháns of Máwar-un-Nahr of the Afrásiyábí dynasty.

Next, in the same foot-note, † page 280 of the *Contributions*,” Mr. Blochmann says that “Minháj-i-Siráj” does not mean in prose, ‘Minháj, *the son of Siráj*,’ but Minháj who writes under the name of Siráj. That the “father's name was Siráj has nothing to do with it.”

Mr. Blochmann would find it difficult to show me where he “writes under the name of Siráj.” I suppose it will be allowed that that Author *knew his own name*, and his father's, and if that be allowed, he calls himself repeatedly Minháj-ud-Dín-i-Saráj, and he further says that his father was the Mauláná Saráj-ud-Dín, whose father was the Mauláná Minháj-ud-Dín, 'Uṣmán, whose father was the Imám, 'Abd-ul-Khálik, the Júrjání. For

these reasons ABÚ-'UMR-I-'USMÁN, who is also called MINHÁJ-UD-DÍN, sometimes styles himself in his work—MINHÁJ-I-SARÁJ-I-MINHÁJ—referring to father and grandfather also. Here are two *izáfats*, and in prose too. See also note 7, page 727 of my Translation.

I have already shown Mr. Blochmann's theory of "artificial" *izáfats*, as he calls them, to be "*un-Persian*," but, to prove that another statement here made is likewise incorrect, I must prominently notice another *izáfat*. It refers to the article "*Who were the 'Patan' or 'Pathan' Sultáns of Dihlí*"—the paper in the JOURNAL A. S. BENGAL, for 1875, page 31. Mr. Blochmann says in the same foot-note, † page 280, "*Contributions*," para. 2, "The form of the name of Muhammad-i-Súrí, on whose name Major Raverty has built a hypothesis, is doubtful for this *Izáfat*."

Mr. Blochmann, apparently, did not notice that the matter of the *kasrah* of *izáfat*, at page 31 of the JOURNAL, has reference *solely* to FIRISH-TAH and his translators. If he will take the trouble to refer to my Translation, page 316, and to the corresponding place, page ۳۸—38 of the Calcutta Printed Text, he will find the heading, SÚRÍ, son OF MUHAMMAD, showing that here Súrí is itself a Ghúrí name. Then let him turn to page 320 of the Translation, and he will find the heading "MALIK MUHAMMAD *bin* SÚRÍ", but in the corresponding place in the printed text page ۴۰—40, merely ملك محمد سوري. If I chose to be guided by Mr. Blochmann's theory on that heading alone, and did not know that the *kasrah* of توصيفي or description was required, and was in any doubts respecting the persons I was writing about, I might have called him, as Mr. Blochmann would, Muhammad Súrí, as though the two names belonged to *one* man, and have turned *two* men into *one* accordingly. The printed text also mentions him as محمد سوري twice in the same page, but a third time, in the last line of that page, when speaking of Malik Muhammad having made over Ghúr to his *eldest* son, his name is given with his father's and grandfather's name—امير ابو علي بن محمد بن سوري viz. :—Amír Bú 'Alí, son of Muhammad, son of Súrí.

Look again at the following heading in the Printed Text—page ۴۱—41, and there it is again confirmed, and we have علي بن محمد بن سوري—Abú-'Alí, son of Muhammad, son of Súrí, but in the ninth line, the father is again called محمد سوري the *izáfat* being understood. The next heading also refers to Muhammad being Súrí's son, viz. :—'Abbás, son of Shís, son of Muhammad, son of Súrí.

If my long note on this subject, 7, page 321, had been read before taxing me with building up a doubtful "hypothesis," it might have been seen that in the Kitáb-i-Yamíní, the author of which was contemporary with this very Muhammad, son of Súrí, who it is pretended [merely because Dow and Briggs so rendered it and made a Pathán of him], was called

Muhammad Súrí, he is never once referred to as Muhammad but as ابن سوري *the son of Súrí*. The *Tárikh-i-Alfí*, *Faṣīḥ-í*, *Jahán-Ará*, *Rauzat-uṣ-Ṣafá*, *Ḥabīb-us-Siyar*, *Mir'át-i-Jahán-Numá*, and *Muntakhab-ut-Tawárikh*, call him *son of Súrí* only; and in the account of Maḥmúd-i-Sabuk-Tigín's raid upon the Ghúris in the *Jámi'-ut-Tawárikh* he is also merely called *son of Súrí*: never Muhammad. The Bengal A. S. Library contains a copy [No. 14] of this work, and Mr. Blochmann can refer to it. He will find, if the portion copied for me has been correctly copied, that in the first two places this Ghúrián chief is called شوری Shúrí—a mistake of ش for س but, four or five lines from the end of the paragraph, he is styled پسر شوری *pisar-i-Shúrí*—that is the *son of SHÚRÍ*, and it is clear that Rashíd-ud-Dín followed the *Kitáb-i-Yamíní* and styled him *son of Súrí* likewise, but that, in two instances, the copyist of that MS. No. 14, or the Calcutta *kátib*, left out the word پسر before the name, in the first two instances.

If the two words 'Alí Mardán *alone* mean 'Alí *who was as valiant as many men*, and if Muhammad Sherán *alone* also mean Muhammad *who was equal to many Lions*, and his brother is also "equal to many Lions" [rather strange that *both* brothers should be so], whence come these *five* or *six* "artificial" words, since without artificial means being adopted, the words 'Alí Mardán are—' *Alí men*—and Muhammad Sherán—*Muhammad Lions*? These words would, without the *kasrah* of description be much the same as Sháh Jahán—*King World*—referred to in what I have said on the *izáfats*, and which is a complete answer also to these questions. Muhammadan "School Registers" have nothing to do with it. The Khalj Turks of Garmsír did not keep any Registers.

As this answer to Mr. Blochmann's criticisms may fall under the notice of readers not acquainted with the Írání dialect of the Persian, and as he constantly refers me to his "Aín," I must point out how inconsistent he is himself about these *izáfats*—I do not think I can be taxed with inconsistency—and how often his *izáfats* are used *when they are not required*, and *wanting when not used*. These inconsistencies, which I take from his translation of the *Aín-i-Akbarí*, may be seen at a glance; he appears to have no *fixed* system:—"Mír Sharíf-i-Ámulí" requires the *izáfats* according to his theory, but, as Mír Sharíf was a native of Ámul, the *yá-i-nisbat* or of relation affixed to Ámul—آملي—*i. e. of Ámul*—as it is written in the MS. from which it is taken, was sufficient; as *Fárs*—Persia, *Fársí*—Persian or of Persia; and Panj-áb—Panj-ábí; Afghán, Afghání, &c. The same occurs in "Shaikh Faríd-i-Bukhárí," which last word containing the *yá-i-nisbat* means, *of Bukhárá*, or the Bukhárián. As is now stands it is "Shaikh Faríd the *Bukhárí*." Again, in the words "'Aláuddín-i-Khiljí," although, at the very first page of Part III. of the "*Contributions*" referred to, the word *Khiljí* is called *an adjective*.

In another place, I find, "A'zam Khán" vide *Khán-I-A'zam* [see example of *Izáfát* previously given], and we find "Khán-I-A'zam" accordingly, but *Mír-i-'Adl* [as I should write it] is not correct according to Mr. Blochmann's theory: it must be "*Mír 'Adl.*" For example, I will give a list of some of the titular names and patronymics, and Mr. Blochmann's *different ways* of writing them:—

"Chingiz Khán" in histories called "Qáán i Buzurg"; Çadr Jahán Muftí requires no *izáfát*, but "Muftí-I-Mamálik" does, and "Umará-I-Kibár" does; "KhánKhánán" and "Khánkhánán" requires none: "Khán-I-Kalán" does; and "Khán-I-A'zam" does; "Khán 'Álam Fírúz-jang," "Nuçratjang" and "Khán Zamán" require none: "Rustam-I-Zamán," Túzuk-I-Jahángírí, and Farhang-I-Jahángírí do: but Bahár-i-Dánish from me would be a dangerous innovation too, and *my* "Sháh-i-Jahán" is dangerous and *un-Persian*, but "Malikah i Jahán" is not! "Açaf Khán 'Abdul Majíd" requires no *izáfát*, but *the same person* "'Abdul Majíd-I-Açaf Khán" does; Sulaimán Kararání [by-the-bye, there is *no such name*] requires no *izáfát*, but, a little farther on, it requires to be written "Sulaimán-I-Kararání"! I could multiply these examples *ad infinitum*.

Burdan-kot may be due "north of Bagurá (Bogra) in Long. 89° 28', Lat. 25° 8' 25", close to Govindganj, on the Karataya River," but I fail to find it in the 119th Sheet of the Indian Atlas; but great changes must have taken place since Minháj-ud-Dín wrote, when "a river" flowed in front of *his* Burdan kot, "of vast magnitude, the name of which is Bagmatí; and, *when it enters the country of Hindústán*, they style it, in the Hindúí dialect, Samund (ocean) and, in magnitude, breadth, and depth, it is three times more than the river Gang" [Translation, page 561], and the Karataya must therefore have grown "small by degrees and beautifully less."

I did not "*identify* Maksadah": My words [note 4, page 576] are "the Maxadabad *probably* of the old Maps," &c.

Mr. Blochmann at page 284 kindly recommends me to Mr. Thomas's "INITIAL COINAGE OF BENGAL," regarding the reigns of "Muhammad Bakhtyár's" immediate successors; but as I have the account of "Minháj-ud-Dín," "*the sole authority for the period*," and some others, I can dispense with it, and have already done so in my Translation.

I am very glad to find, however, that Mr. Thomas has met with the coins of Ikhtiyár-ud-Dín, DAULAT SHÁH-I-BALKÁ, the Khalj, mentioned in my Translation, page 626 and farther on, which has not appeared in the "*Contributions*," or doubts might probably have been thrown on his very existence as a ruler.

I am told that Sultán Fírúz Sháh-i-Abú-l-Muzaffar, Sháh-i-Jahán, the Habashí, "has not been included" among the "Pathan" dynasties. He will be found in Dow and Briggs, and in the following, respecting some coins found in "Cooch Behar": "*Of the other Bengal Pathans* whose coins occur in this trove, I [Rájendralála Mitra] have to notice FIRUZ SHAH THE ABYSSINIAN." See *Bengal A. S. Journal*, 1864, page 481.

Page 285, of the "*Contributions*," Mr. Blochmann says regarding Jáj-nagar, "Major Raverty *has come* to the same conclusion as *I had*."

This is really too magnanimous on his part, and more than I can accept. I beg leave to state that I *had* come to the conclusion many years before I offered the Translation, of the *Ṭabakát-i-Násirí* to the Society: in fact, in 1865.

Mr. Blochmann will find Katásin by and bye: I shall have something to say about it hereafter.

Page 285, "*Contributions*," it is said, "Major Raverty's assertion that 'Lakhnautí' was called by the Emperor Humáyún 'Bakhtábád,' is untenable." If Mr. Blochmann thinks Bakhtábád is a copyist's error, he can satisfy himself, for, of course, he had seen and consulted the "*Khuláçat uttawárikh*," which is "a modern work." It is an excellent one nevertheless in many ways. I found the two copies I consulted quite similar, and quoted it accordingly. Page 286 of "*Contributions*," we have "*As the borderland* to the west of Jáj-nagar Major Raverty mentions Garhá-Katanka, and then says (page 587) quoting the *Ma'dan-i-Akhabár-i-Ahmadí* that 'on the north it is close to the Bháṭah territory [the Bháṭí of the *Áin-i-Akbarí*], and, south, is close to the Dakhan.' "But this is an extraordinary confusion of names, partly due to the author of the *Ma'dan*, especially "if he wrote Bhatah with a long á. He means Bhāth, or Bhat-ghorá, the "mountainous tract south of Alláhábád, whilst Bháṭí is the name of the "Sundarban region along the Bay of Bengal," &c.

Mr. Blochmann has evidently not seen "the *Ma'dan*," but that Bháṭí is written, or rather *printed*, with a long á, is not due to "the *Ma'dan*" at all, but to "the *Áin*"—my MS. original I mean. The *Ma'dan* has بهته but I, foolishly depending on my *Áin-i-Akbarí* as a better authority, put it in as I found it there بهاتي with i. So what is supposed to be an error of "the *Ma'dan's*" is really mine from being thus led astray. Whether Mr. Blochmann's *Áin* contains it I cannot say, but the *Áin* before me has بهاتي. I see nothing, even according to Mr. Blochmann, particularly wrong even in the *Jámi'-ut-Tawárikh*, although it is styled a "compilation without value," when we consider what natives write imagine regarding the cardinal points; and that work evidently refers to the Bháṭí Sundar-ban which was S. W. from the place, probably, where the author of it wrote.

Whether Bhaṭah, Bhāṭah, Bhaṭī, or Bhāṭī, with long or short *a*, it comes from the same original. In the *Āin* translation it is said: “Abulfazl gives this spelling in the ‘Akbar-nāmah,’ and says it means *lowland* from the Hindústānī *بهاتي*, *down the river.*” The word is written in Hindi *بهاتي* and *بهتي*.

As to the “stone” wall in the same paragraph of the “Contributions,” referring to note page 595 of my Translation, I mentioned that “I am not *personally* acquainted with Bengal,” but my *Āin*’s words respecting it are as follows:—

در سرکار سنکیو از دریای کذک تا کوه سنکین دیواری کشیده اند

I wonder how any one would read that, the *hamzah*—ء—expressing the *izāfat* being added to *کوه* even according to the “Túrānī” idiom? To express what Mr. Blochmann says of the stone wall, I should have expected to have found it written *سنکین دیواری کشیده اند از دریای کذک تا کوه* and then there could be no possible mistake even for a copyist to make in MS.

In a foot-note to page 286 also it is said: “Major Raverty mentions [it should have *added* what *I really did* say at page 592] the Afghán Zamíndár of Bír bhúm and *Ját-nagar*—the italics, I daresay, imply a reference to Jáj-nagar,” &c.—*I daresay* they imply nothing of the sort; and the previous *twenty-six* paragraphs on Jáj-nagar, extending over *six pages*, will show, to any ordinary eye, where I consider Jáj-nagar to be.

Persons not absolutely acquainted with a locality may at 6000 miles’ distance, in the extreme west of England, and not having the staff of a *Madrasah* at command, and *on the spot*, be involved in error by a clerical mistake in a MS., and in proof of this and show that he is not immaculate, I will give a single instance out of many in Mr. Blochmann’s own *Āin* Translation, quoting the Ma’áşir-ul-Umará, although he is *in* India.

Page 422, vol. i. :—“Regarding the town of Bhakkar, Abulfazl says that it is called in old books Mançúrah. *SIX rivers* united pass by it in *several branches* (sic); *TWO branches* lie to the south, *ONE* to the north. The town *at the latter branch*, is called Bhakkar. On the second branch another town lies, called Loharí, and *near it is the Indus.*”

So, according to this, “Bhakkar” and “Loharí” are not *on the Indus*, but *near* it!

The following is, literally, what the Ma’áşir-ul-Umará, says:—“Bhakar is the name of a fort among the erections of former times—in old books they write it Manşúrah—and all the *six* northern rivers [*i. e.* the Indus and the Panj-áb], having become one, pass by it—one portion passing on the southern side, and one part on the northern. The *kaşbahs* named Sakhar—سکھر—a town on one bank of the river, and another town, known as

Lhorí,—*لهوري*—on the other side [Sindhís often substitute *r* for *l*] were always included in Sind. Mírzá Sháh Husain, the Arghún, entirely rebuilt it [Bhakar] of exceeding great strength, and made it over to Sultán Muhammad-i-Kokal-Tásh.”

This is perfectly intelligible to any one who has seen Sakhar, Bhakar, and Rohrí, or looked at a map only. Notwithstanding the “learned” Abú-l-Fazl, however, Mansúrah was a totally different place to Bhakar, and some 200 miles farther down the river. See page 540 of my Translation, and note, last para. of that page.

With reference to what is called [*“Contributions,”* page 279,] my “dangerous innovations” in spelling names, which in reality means that everything is innovating which may be contrary to Mr. Blochmann’s system, I foresaw, at the outset, that we should not agree in this matter, we having, it appears, peculiar ideas on this point. Such Bengal names as are derived from the Sanscrit may, in some instances, be not quite correct: I have written them as my Persian authorities write them, and from my system of transliteration—the Jonesian system—the original letters may be known. In some few places “the printer’s devil” has left his mark upon them [as he has in my Paper on “*the Pathán Dynasties,*” with a vengeance], and Mr. Blochmann was in such a hurry that he did not wait for the list of errata to my Translation, but thought he had made a discovery. For example: the word Aşif is an error for Aşaf; Bikrámpúr for Bikrampúr, Jessore for Jellasore, and Dínjápúr for Dínájpúr. The last will be found correctly at page 559.

As to the rest, referred to in note † of the same page of the “*Contributions,*” I do not agree as to the word Sálár being part of the name: it refers to a chief—*Sipah-Sálár* may be a proper name after the same fashion. In ELLIOT [page 315, vol. ii.] the man’s title and name are actually translated “*victorious general.*” I shall expect with some curiosity Mr. Blochmann’s strictures or otherwise on this translation of “*Minháj-us-Siráj.*” *ظفر* — Zafar—means *victory*—so it would be *Sálár victory*—chief victory—if translated. Arabic words—active participles in particular—are used as Musalmán names and titles, but it is new to find the noun Zafar—victory—used for the purpose.

Minháj-ud-Dín, and a score of others write Kálbí—it is used as well as Kálpí. In Lexicons words beginning with ب *b* and پ *p*, will be *both* found under the letter *b*.

Kuhrám—is spelt thus *كهرام* with *Káf-i-Tázi* and *rá-i-Hindí* in a geographical account of the upper provinces from Dihlí to the Indus, and from thence to Sindh, Kandahár, and all round to Ladákh, and the Antarbed Do-áb, which I should have published but for the years I have given to the *Ṭabakát-i-Násirí*. Elliot also spells it with *k*, not *g*.

Budá'ún is spelt ^وبُدَاوُن and also ^وبُدَاوُن* Budán'ún, the first *n* being nasal; Sursutí—سُرْسُوتِي; Síwastán—سِيوَسْتَان, and also Shíwastán, from Sanskrit शिव, a Hindú deity; Jamádí جمادى is written in the Írání idiom: sometimes Jamádá; 'Arif—عَارِف, 'Arifain—عَارِفَيْن; Tazkirah or Tazkarah, both are correct; Shajr and Shijr both signify a tree in Arabic, hence Shajarah or Shijarah may be used; Saráj, which I have also met with spelt *Siráj*, signifies a lamp, luminary, or the sun, hence Saráj-ud-Dín, the father, means “the Luminary of the Faith,” as his son's name, Minháj-ud-Dín signifies “the Highway or Road of the Faith”; Waná-Gangá—وَنَاكَنگَا; Gúdáwuri [ask a Madrásí how he pronounces it]—گُوَدَاوُورِي; Rásín—رَاسِيْن; Chhotah Nág-púr چھوٹہ ناگپور; Jhár Kundah جھار کُنڈہ and جھار کُنڈہ [signifying bushy, a forest, the forest of Baijnáth] and is also written in some of the works quoted in my Translation with چ — چھار کُنڈہ; and Karmah-násah is written كَرْمَه نَاسَه and Karam-Násá كَرْم نَاسَا.

The Haft-Iklím of Mr. Blochmann may be different, but my copies of that “excellent work” have precisely what I have given at page 593. As to when the author finished his work, or where he got his Hindí ढ from, may be seen from that work. Perhaps Mr. Blochmann will examine one. Possibly he may have seen a small letter ط written over letters, which are intended to express ت ت ت.

The word پايان, as any Dictionary will show, means “depression,” “lowliness,” “inferiority,” as well as “end” and “extremity.”

Arkhnák is “the printer's devil's” work for Arkhánk, also written رخنك—Rakhang—anglicized Arracan.

I have lived too long in the DAKHAN ever to write it Dak'hin, and I have never written it *Dak'han*; neither could I think of writing Abú Bakr where Abú Bikt is meant.

Mr. Blochmann taxes me with making “dangerous innovations” in spelling proper and geographical names, but he has a peculiar method of his own, and I must point some of them out. I take them merely from the first volume of his Translation of the Aín-i-Akbarí, to which he so often refers me:—

“Mullá *Mubárik*,” also “Qutbuddín *Mubárik* Sháh” and “Shaikh *Mubárik*,” even on the covers, for Shaikh Mubárah, Mullá Mubárah, &c. “Rahtás” instead of Rohtás; “Pasháwar,” instead of Pesháwar [پيشاور is written in Pushto with its peculiar ك'H or س'H. “Harát” for Hirát [It

* Major Raverty's original has *sukúns* above the *dál*, the medial and the final *nún*. Lower down, in 'arifain, the *sukúns* stand above the *fe* and the *nún*. Types with fixed diacritical marks are not to be had here.—ED.

may have been supposed that, as Harí was the ancient name, natives of it styled Harawí, and that the river is still the Harí river, "Harát" must be right]; "Darogah" for Dárogah; "Farmilí" for Farmulí; "Zúl-nún" for Zú-u-Nún [Jonas]; "Zúzan," for Zozan or Zauzan; "Jhelam" [whence the *e*?], for Jhilam; "Sodharah," for Súdhará; "Shujá" for Shuja; "Bhambar," for Bhimbar; "Bigrám," for Bagram; "Pak'halí" for Pakhlí or Paklí; "Qárlyghs," as the transliteration of قارلوق—Kárlúgh; "Bhírah and Khusháb," for Bharah and Khúsháb; "Sewe," for Síwí; "Baloch," for Balúch; "Duáb," for Do-áb or Do-ábah; "Chanáb," for Chináb; "Sukkar" and "Suk'har opposite Bhakkar," for Sakhar and Bhakar or Bhakhar; "Qanauj," for Kinnauj; "Gálnah," for Jálnah; "Guhram," for Kuhram; "Tiranbak," for Trimbak and Trimbak; "Qalát," for Kalát; "Sahwán," for Sihwán; "Dará Shikoh," for Dará Shukoh; "Qoran" and "Qorán," for Qur'an; "Kázarún," for Kázirún; "Sulaimán Kararání" and "Sulaimán *i* Kararání," in several places, for Sulímán, the Karání: ["Kararání" is an impossible name]; "Músá Razá," for Músá-i-Rizá [*i. e.* the son of Músá-ul-Kázim, the Imám]; "Khattar," for Khat-har [کھتھار]; "Dilahzák," for Dilazák; "Raushánís, who like other Afghán tribes," &c., there being no such Afghán tribe whatever; "Khán Jahán Lodhí," for Khán-i-Jahán, Lodí; "District of Mount Teráh," for Hill tract of Tírah: "Táiqán" for Táekán.

The system of writing 'Arabic words is after the same uncertain fashion:—at one time, "Makhdúm-ul-Mulk," at another, "Makhdúm ulmulk;" "Mui'zzulmulk" at one time: "Mu'izz-ul-Mulk", and "Mu'izz-ul Mulk" another; "Zakhírat ulkhawánín" at one time, "Zakhíratul-khawánín," another; "Çimçám uddaulah," for Şamşam-ud-Daulah*; "Abú-jahl," for Abú-Jhal*; "Rauzatuççafá," for Rauzat-uş-Safá, and the like.

Some 'Arabic titular names and patronymics *require* the 'Arabic *Al* to give them sense, such as "Mihrunnisá," for Mihr-*un*-Nisá, and "'Abd-ul Majíd" for 'Abd-*ul*-Majíd, but with other words, used according to the Persian idiom, which require an equivalent to this *Al* in the shape of the *kasrah* of description the *Izáfat* is *wrong*, "dangerous," "*un*-Persian", and must be "Núr Jahán", "Núr Mahall", like Sháh Jahán, which mean, respectively, thus written, "Light-world," "Light-palace or house," and, "King-World," *instead of* Núr-i-Jahán—The Light of the World; Núr-i-Mahall—The Light of the Palace or House; Sháh-i-Jahán—The King of the World; and yet, when he comes to translate them, Mr. Blochmann *adds* these "artificial" *izáfats* to get the *the* and *of the*, as in "Çadr Jahán"—Muftí *of the* empire; and "'Abdurrahím Khár†"—Abdurrahim *the* Ass, &c.

* Thus in printed original. Ed.

† The long á in Major Raverty's printed original. Ed.

In concluding these remarks I think what I have here given is sufficient reason for my saying that, in the matter of *izáfats*, and system of spelling proper and geographical names, I shall never follow Mr. Blochmann.

Note.—The above article has been inserted at the urgent request of Major Raverty. As he has now stated his views on Persian Grammar, &c., and Mr. Blochmann does not think it necessary to write a 'Rejoinder', the subject has come to a close. ED.

~~~~~

*Morals of Kálidása.*—By PRANNÁTH PAṆḌIT, M. A.

It has been remarked by a great philosopher that the conception of man as the chief of the economy of nature is a stimulus to the cultivation of the noble qualities, which place him at the head of the living hierarchy. There can be, he observes, no danger of apathy in a position like this,—with the genuine and just pride of such pre-eminence stirring within us; and above us the type of perfection, below which we must remain, but which will ever be inviting us upwards.\* Viewed in this light, it may not be uninteresting to investigate the moral type which the greatest of Indian poets held up for imitation to his contemporaries, men within whom there stirred not only the pride of being placed at the head of the living hierarchy, but that of being the highest development of the human race.

The four divisions of Morality which I have adopted in this paper are the following:

- I. Individual.
- II. Domestic.
- III. Social.
- IV. Military and Political.

And I may here mention once for all, that neither in the principles, nor in the details of classification, do I pretend any claims to originality.

**INDIVIDUAL MORALITY. Self-conservation.**—In the first great subdivision of Individual Morality, namely, self-conservation, Kálidása does not fail us. He tells us of *Dilípa* that he guarded himself, though not through fear† to which the advice of the disguised *Shiva* that the body is the first requisite for religious works‡ may serve as a commentary. *Nandiní* advises the same king to preserve his body, the enjoyer of continuous hap-

\* Comte's Positive Philosophy, translated by H. Martineau, Vol. II, p. 554.

† जुगोपात्मानमत्रस्तः । Raghu., I, 21.

‡ शरीरमाद्यं खलु धर्मसाधनम् । Kumára Sambhava, V. 33.